



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Classical Philology

VOLUME XII

October 1917

NUMBER 4

HORACE AND VALERIUS CATO

By G. L. HENDRICKSON

III

THE NEOTERIC POETS AND THE LATIN PURISTS

In the present study, the last of the three under my common title, I shall endeavor to draw some conclusions for the literary history of the period of transition from Catullus to the early Augustans, which seem to be indicated by the results arrived at in the two preceding papers. If it should be conceded, as I have attempted to show in the first of those papers,¹ that the initial eight lines of the tenth satire, contained in one important group of manuscripts, are not forgery or interpolation, but preserve the poet's original introduction, it will appear that Cato, whom they name, and others of his following are the target toward which the polemic of that composition was directed, both in its original and in its revised form. To point out the applicability of the criticism, which by deletion of the opening lines no longer names its goal, to Cato and his group was the object of my second paper.² In these two studies I hope to have defined, with more sharpness of outline than has before been possible, the literary background of the fourth and tenth satires, to have shown, in fact, that the elusive opponents of Horace, who are concealed behind an anonymous *adversarius*, opprobrious epithets and pseudonyms, and a group of real names of humbler followers, are the

¹ *Classical Philology*, XI (1916), 249 ff.

² *Ibid.*, XII (1917), 77 ff.

most important and influential group of Roman poets and critics of the time, the heirs and custodians of the poetical legacy of Catullus and Calvus. The dependence of Cato and his followers upon these two classical names is referred to satirically in the contemptuous allusion to one of Cato's satellites,

simius iste
nil praeter Calvum et doctus cantare Catullum.

Whether the person here referred to be Furius Bibaculus (as I conjectured from the data preserved in Suetonius) or another does not greatly matter.¹ The main point is the connection which the phrase establishes between Cato and his school,² and Catullus and Calvus as the source of their literary inspiration.

To determine what other important literary figures of the time (in addition to Furius) can be grouped with Cato as friends or members of his circle, our record is insufficient. The only specific names afforded in connection with him (apart from his mention in Catullus) are Tigidas and Cinna, whom Suetonius cites among the admirers of Cato's poetry. But setting aside for the present such larger relationships, and confining ourselves to the group actually disclosed by our satire, it is worthy of note that Horace employs for his satirical attack the reproach which attached to the profession of teaching.³ From the sarcastic title *grammaticorum equitum doctissimus* of the initial lines, which is applied to Cato, to the contemptuous dismissal of Demetrius and Tigellius at the end,

discipularum inter iubeo plorare cathedras,

there is a tone of scorn for the environment in which Cato and his followers exercise the literary profession: they are professional teachers—Cato himself most distinguished of the gild, Demetrius and Tigellius humbler practitioners of the same art. With scornful allusion to Cato's facilities for making his poetry known Horace says,

an tua demens
vilibus in ludis dictari carmina malis?

¹ The identity of Furius with the *turgidus Alpinus* of vs. 36 is more securely attested; cf. *Classical Philology*, XII, 86.

² *Simius iste* = *simius Catonis*, since we have seen that the *adversarius* of 1. 10 is essentially Cato. *Iste* in Horace is almost invariably a demonstrative of the second person, in accordance with the conventional grammatical teaching. It cannot, therefore, refer to Hermogenes.

³ Cf. the excursus to the first paper of this series, *Classical Philology*, XI, 267.

In arrogant contrast,

non ego: nam satis est equitem mihi plaudere.

This serves to introduce the impressive list of names with which Horace concludes, among whom none, so far as can be discerned, are to be classified in the ranks of the grammatical-pedagogical profession. It is the same antipathy to the pretensions of professional opinion and criticism which Horace later reveals:

non ego, nobilium scriptorum auditor et ultor,
grammaticas ambire tribus et pulpita dignor. [*Epp.* 1. 19. 40.]

This passage, while it shows abundant contempt and scorn, nevertheless reveals the fact that there was a strong and influential body of professional criticism (comparable perhaps to the modern literary press) which had not a little to do with the making and unmaking of contemporary literary reputations.¹ Cato had evidently enjoyed this sort of authority in full measure, and it was doubtless with reference to it that the couplet which Suetonius quotes was spoken:

Cato grammaticus, Latina Siren,
qui solus legit ac facit poetas.

For whether sincere or ironical, in any case the lines are meant to have point, and they play upon the humorous paradox of "creating poets" (*ποιεῖν ποιητάς*) and of "making" poetical reputations by the authority of the critic's readings.²

Horace and his friends, on the other hand, are dilettanti, under the leadership or patronage of such noble gentlemen as Maecenas, Asinius, or Messala, displaying a snobbish pride in the superior social station reflected from their patrons and in the greater rigor and purity of their stylistic tenets. To discover other lines of cleavage between these groups would be to travel outside the record, although it is a fair conjecture that Cato's circle was aligned politically rather with the opponents of Octavian's growing power. Concerning Cato himself there is no evidence, but it is recorded that *Furius* continued to assail Octavian with his epigrams, as he had

¹ The whole of the nineteenth letter bears upon this question, and Horace does not hesitate to acknowledge that his scorn has been a barrier to the recognition of his poetry. Cf. especially vs. 35.

² Compare in this connection what is said of the activity of *Caecilius Epirota*, the freedman of Atticus and friend of Gallus: "Primus Vergilium et alios poetas novos praelegere coepisse, quod etiam Domitii Marsi versiculus indicat: *Epirota, tenellorum nutricula vatum*" (Suet. *Gram.* 16).

assailed Julius before. Furthermore, if our Pitholeon (vs. 22) be identical with M. Voltacilius Pitholaus, as Bentley argued, it appears that his abusive epigrams against Julius Caesar, while tolerated, were not, as in the case of Catullus and Calvus, pardoned.¹

If now we look at the text of Horace alone and confess that identification of Cato in the tenth satire depends upon recognition of the authenticity of the initial eight lines, and that the presence of Furius Bibaculus is not established beyond possibility of doubt, there may be hesitation in accepting with confidence the definition of Horace's opponents which has been made. Here fortunately an independent bit of evidence comes to our aid and does much to confirm the reasonable probability (which I venture to believe has already been established) of the correctness of our conclusion. Our witness is, in fact, no other than Messala, a member and leader of the very group with which Horace is identified. We owe it to the antiquarian and philological interest of Suetonius that a brief fragment is preserved containing a judgment which runs singularly parallel to the position of Horace as we have elicited it from the study of the tenth satire. It is given merely for the sake of illustrating the usage of the word *litterator*, but in the light of the preceding argument it will be seen that it becomes a text of capital value for the whole problem of literary relationships which has been raised.

Eosdem [*sc.* grammaticos] litteratores vocitatos Messala Corvinus in quadam epistula ostendit, non esse sibi dicens rem cum Furio Bibaculo, ne cum Ticida quidem, aut litteratore Catone. [*De gram.* 4.]

Curious chance that a fragment so casually preserved, in an alien context, should read so like a summary of agreement with that which we have gathered from the text of Horace! Here we find from one definitely associated with Horace and holding a position of leadership in his literary group express repudiation of the two principal figures of our tenth satire, Cato and Furius. With them is associated a third, the poet Ticidas, whom Horace does not name, but who, as we have seen above, is quoted by Suetonius as one of the admirers of Cato's poetry. All that we know of him from other sources confirms the correctness of Messala's association of him with Cato. From Ovid

¹ For Furius see Tacitus *Ann.* 4. 34. For Pitholaus, Suet. *Jul.* 75. For the reconciliation of Caesar with Calvus and Catullus, *ibid.* 73.

and Apuleius we learn that he was an erotic elegist; the line cited by Suetonius is obviously from an encomiastic epigram; the single citation in Priscian is from an hymeneal ode (*Ticidas in Hymeneo*) which betrays the influence of Catullus.¹

That there is some community of purpose in the repudiation of the same group of poets by Horace and Messala cannot be doubted. To determine this common purpose and point of view is the problem which confronts us. The time and circumstance of Messala's utterance is unknown. *In quadam epistula*, says Suetonius, and in imagination one might (with a warning to the literal-minded!) entertain the fancy that the letter in question was Messala's acknowledgment to Horace of his vigorous satire.² Since the vogue and authority of Cato and Furius are implied (and they were already well advanced in years at the time of the tenth satire) it would not be natural to assume a later date for Messala's words.

The whole tone of Horace's composition reveals the support of a sympathetic group or clique, of which Messala is one. In defining the original constitution of this group we cannot simply take over the imposing list of names at the end of the satire, which, I feel convinced, represents the expanded circle of Horace's powerful friends at the time when the tenth satire was made the epilogue of his first book (35 B.C.). We shall get nearer to the truth of the original controversy by looking rather at the names contained within the body of the composition, which are then to be sure practically all repeated at the end. Indeed this fact of repetition is, I suspect, itself evidence of the appended character of the final names. Pursuing this course we see, first of all, that Messala Corvinus is named as an example in oratorical prose of that purity of Latin diction at which poetry should aim (vs. 29). Secondly, that in contrast with Furius Bibaculus (*turgidus Alpinus*) a list of poets and *genres* are named as exemplifying the new direction in poetry with which Horace groups his own efforts:

turgidus Alpinus iugulat dum Memnona dumque
diffingit Rheni luteum caput, haec ego ludo, etc.

¹ For the testimonia concerning Ticidas, cf. Schanz, I, 2, p. 87.

² Quite without reason or reflection the manuals of Roman literature assign this fragment to the learned studies of Messala, as if he were discussing the usage of the word *litterator*.

Horace then names with epithets of praise Fundanius for comedy, Pollio for tragedy, Varius for epic, Virgil for pastoral, and with them associates himself modestly in satire. The principle which gives coherence to this group is doubtless friendship in the first instance and personal sympathy. But contact with such personalities as Messala, Asinius, and Varius cannot, in a time of active theoretical ferment, have been without influence upon literary principles, and we may therefore believe that Horace appeals to these names as exemplifying the principles which have been defined in this satire, partly in criticism of Lucilius and partly in contrast to Cato and his followers. While Horace, by his scorn of their defense of Greek words and by his sneers at the Latinity of Furius, implies that his opponents were careless and perverse workmen, yet we need not take him too seriously, nor can we believe that Cato, the friend of Catullus and Cinna, was one to condone loose workmanship. It is a difference of principle which is involved, and Horace magnifies slight differences to great contrasts, as is the manner in such controversies: the immediate past is always bad, but worst of all is its persistence into the present. Catullus, Calvus, Cinna, and therefore most certainly Cato and Furius as well, were proudly conscious of great advance in artistry over earlier Latin poetry; but new refinements of stylistic taste, and reactions from mannerism and excess stamped the elegance and embellishment of yesterday as crudity and fustian to be shunned today.

One clear antithesis, however, does emerge. It is the fact that, while the opposing group (exemplified in this instance only by the name of Furius) are devotees of the neo-Hellenistic school—writers of minor epics, elegy, and the epigram—the group which Horace names is seen to have a wider range and a more generous ambition. With the exception of Virgil they appear as composers of forms which reach back of Alexandrinism to the older Greek models, the Homeric epic (*forte epos*), Attic tragedy and comedy. Virgil, to be sure, in latinizing the Theocritean idyl is Alexandrine, but even he had abandoned the beaten track of elegy and epyllion. With the exception of the pastoral these are all renewals of those forms which made up the older Roman literature, the epic of Ennius, the comedy of Plautus and Terence, the tragedy of Accius, the Lucilian satire.

Such considerations may lead to the thought that one of the principles of coherence of the group is a sort of patriotic renewal of the older classical literature of Rome, in a form suited to the severer standards of a new age; not to follow in the track of the popular neo-Hellenism, but to produce a literature in language and spirit thoroughly Latin, though drawing its inspiration and, where necessary, its material from Greek models. It is not too much to see some hint of this nationalistic spirit in that passage of our satire which ridicules the praise of Greek words in Latin, and which leads up to the enumeration of the poets and literary forms under consideration. Certainly something of patriotic appeal is intended by such lines as

scilicet oblitus patriae patrisque Latini,¹

and

atque ego cum Graecos facerem, natus mare citra,
versiculos, vetuit me tali voce Quirinus.

But these are merely hints and suggestions which provoke the idea. The truth of this interpretation cannot be established by external evidence or direct affirmation; it must be established, if at all, by an examination of the actual work of the two schools, supplemented here and there by such theoretical utterances as our meager record preserves.

Horace's boyhood and awakening literary sense fell in the time just subsequent to the death of Catullus. The old standards of literary values still prevailed in the school of Orbilius and were maintained with stern discipline against the intoxication of the "new poetry." But, while the sweet liquor of the new Hellenism was drunk eagerly by the rising age, men of the generation of Orbilius, Cicero, and Varro clung tenaciously to the old. To them the old Latin poetry was already a classical unit, set off from the present by nearly half a century from the death of Lucilius and Accius. Horace himself in the letter to Augustus gives the most complete

¹ I take the opportunity of allusion to this line to add a word of explanation concerning *patrisque Latini*. Latinus does not, to be sure, appear elsewhere as the ancestor of the Roman people in a political or social sense (like Romulus or Quirinus). But as the ultimate ancestor of the *Latin-speaking* race he is named in similar manner by Varro, *L.L.* 5. 9: "non enim videbatur consentaneum quaerere me in eo verbo quod finxisset Ennius causam, neglegere quod ante *rex Latinus* finxisset."

expression of the obstinate, unreasoning esteem in which this literature was held, although it is difficult to say whether his account refers to conditions of his youth or to some recrudescence of the older admiration at the time of his writing (17 B.C.):

(Roma) habet hos numeratque poetas
ad nostrum tempus Livi scriptoris ab aevo.

The truth of this somewhat ironical account of Roman literary taste, at least for the time of Cicero and Varro, admits of abundant confirmation. A brief survey of the places and contexts in which the larger fragments of Ennius and Accius are found is sufficient evidence.¹ For Cicero it is scarcely too much to say that Greek tragedy, for example, exists for him essentially in the versions of Ennius and Accius. Greek philosophers and orators may perhaps be read most naturally in Greek, but to prefer Euripides and Sophocles to the Roman tragedians is an intolerable mark of sloth or of affected disdain (*De fin.* i. 2. 4 and i. 3. 7). It is plain that Cicero is arguing the old Roman cause against a rising tide of opposition (*Opt. gen. orat.* 6. 18), but certainly not without much sympathy and success, as Varro and Horace show. To Cicero these men are not mere translators, but poets in their own right, *qui non verba, sed vim Graecorum expresserunt poetarum* (*Acad.* i. 3. 10). Something of Roman quality and personality has passed into their renderings, and has resulted in a Roman literature to be looked upon, not as a mere counterpart to Greek in Latin words, but as a true successor, strong in its own right. Some such conception of the independent value of early Roman poetry was entertained by its defenders, the truth of which the investigations of recent years have tended to confirm. We owe it to the penetrating and sympathetic scholarship of Leo that this point of view has at length found adequate and enduring expression.²

In the diction of this earlier Roman poetry we pass quickly from the easy colloquial employment of Greek words in Plautus to the conscious purism of Ennius, which became, in fact, a norm of usage for subsequent Latin poetry. As time went on it was inevitable

¹ See especially the admirable survey in Vahlen's *Ennius*. The passages from Cicero form an entertaining anthology of comment and criticism (p. xxxix ff.).

² *Geschichte der röm. Literatur*, Vol. I (1913), *passim*.

that some new words should be adopted from the Greek, but the fragments of Accius show few additions to the Greek words which have been fixed in the language from Plautus' time. Afranius, as befits the writer of the *togata*, is rigorous in exclusion. Afranius is indeed a very characteristic figure of the growing tendency of Roman literature toward a larger independence than either Ennius or Accius had employed. To be sure, in the actual practice of tragical composition Accius would seem to have exercised a freedom toward his originals not very different from the complete independence which the *togata* afforded to Afranius. But whereas Accius abode by the tradition of producing plays upon Greek originals, Afranius undertook to dramatize Roman life and manners in Roman costume. He professed freely his indebtedness to Menander, but this does not differ from his indebtedness to Terence and others, whether Greek or Latin, as he says in a well-known fragment. Even Lucilius, with his excessive blending of Greek and Latin words, is not really an exception to the general rule of the increasing severity of Roman standards of pure Latinity for serious literature. What Lucilius gives us when he uses Greek is the literary reproduction of familiar conversation, either playful or technical. Where his treatment is serious or earnest (as Leo notes) his speech is pure Latin. The essential analogue to Lucilius in the use of Greek is Cicero in his familiar letters, for whom in the orations another language than Latin scarcely exists. The vigor and self-consciousness of the movement toward the exclusion of Greek and the establishment of an independent Roman literature may be seen most sharply in some of its excesses, as, for example, in the naïve arrogance of the *Auctor ad Herennium*. Though everywhere his examples and precepts are drawn from Greek writers, yet the name of no Greek author is anywhere found in his pages (Marx, p. 115); Cato, Crassus, and Ennius do service for Isocrates, Demosthenes, and Homer; a few Greek technical terms occur, but nearly always with a Latin interpretation. To this same general tendency belongs Lucretius, not with narrow purism, yet with clearly recognizable intention. For, though he laments the *patrii sermonis egestas*, yet only rarely does he go boldly afield to expand the resources of expression by borrowed Greek. Though he knows the trick of the sensuous Greek line and uses it

occasionally for special effects,¹ yet on the whole he belongs emphatically in the national tradition of Latin for the Romans, as inaugurated by Ennius.

In contrast to this earlier compact tradition of Roman classicism and Latin purity there grew up gradually a new cult of Greek imitation in Latin poetry, which derived its nourishment, not from the old Attic and Ionic models, but from contemporary Greek poetry as it was cultivated in Alexandria and in the cities of Asia Minor. The beginnings of this imitation seized first upon the lighter forms, such as erotic epigrams and trifles, which are discernible in the Lucilian satires and in the few specimens preserved from Catulus, Porcius Licinus, etc. The first striking representative of this type of poetry is Laevius, the fragments of whose *Erotopaegnia* are preserved in considerable number. Here, for the first time in Latin poetry, we catch vaguely the aroma of that new theme in the world's literature, which was destined ultimately to become its largest factor, namely, sentimental, romantic love. Titles like *Alcestis*, *Adonis*, *Helena*, *Protesilaudamia*, *Sirenocirca*, reveal how the figures of the old mythology were being worked over from a new point of view, which already anticipates the treatment familiar to us from the pages of Ovid. The stylistic tone is sentimental, marked by diminutives, bold compounds, and Greek words new to Latin usage, and, though in excess, its kinship with the manner of Catullus is already discernible. It cannot be doubted that Laevius is an important precursor of that school of which Cicero presently speaks contemptuously as the *νεώτεροι*. That this conception of the place of Laevius was entertained in antiquity is clear from Gellius, who places Laevius at the beginning of a series which is continued with the names of Catullus, Calvus, Hortensius, Cinna, Memmius.²

The essential respect in which all this group stands in sharp contrast with the older classical Latin poetry is its attitude toward

¹ Cf. 2. 410 (on the atomic constitution of sounds):

ne tu forte putes serrae stridentis acerbum
horrorem constare elementis levibus aequae
ac musaea mele, per chordas organici quae
mobilibus digitis expergefacta figurant.

The contrast with the preceding line is the special effect aimed at.

² Gellius 19. 9. 7: "nisi Catullus forte pauca et Calvus itidem pauca; nam Laevius implicata et Hortensius invenusta et Cinna inlepidi et Memmius dura, ac deinceps omnes rudia fecerunt atque absona."

Greek. Whereas the older poetry had sought to assimilate Greek ideas and Greek forms, and out of these elements, in new and free combination, to create a national Roman literature, self-sufficient and independent, this new school took quite the opposite direction, and with contempt of older Roman performance endeavored to bring boldly into Roman poetry the graces and vocabulary of Greek itself. It is not too much to call the new poets of deliberate and set purpose *graecissantes*.

To collect the evidence for this opinion with any degree of thoroughness would require much more space than is available, and it would be superfluous, since isolated studies already exist which have done a great part of the necessary work. One point must be kept in mind, namely, that Catullus is for us the first representative of this stylistic tendency whose work is preserved with sufficient fulness to afford an adequate basis of judgment. While it is perhaps true that certain Grecizing tendencies are not more conspicuously illustrated in his work than by later authors, such as Propertius and Ovid, yet we must not overlook the fact that Catullus is much earlier in point of time, and that the effect of his Grecisms must have been much more striking and exotic than similar boldness of a later time, which had lost the shock of novelty.

To make a mere catalogue of the Grecizing tendencies of Catullus is no easy matter. They consist in the choice of literary forms, in the sentimental and romantic treatment of mythological themes (*Ariadne*, *Laodamia*), in translations and adaptations of material which must have seemed as bizarre and exotic to the generation of Cicero as they seem to us (*Coma Berenices*, *Attis*). Coming to details of technique we find that they consist in Grecisms of forms and inflections of proper names, in the general use of Greek words and Greek inflections¹ with a freedom unknown to serious Latin poetry before his time (unless in Laevius), in the ornamental employment of Greek geographical and mythological names, in the affectation of a soft vocalism made up of Greek elements, in mannerisms of versification like the favorite spondaic termination (which Cicero

¹ Cf. Sniehotta, *De vocum Graecarum . . . usu* (Breslauer Abhdlg., ix, 1903, a careful and valuable study by a pupil of Norden), p. 63: "inveniuntur igitur in Catulli carminibus terminationes Graecae, quae ab omnibus qui ante eum versus pepigerunt, multisque eorum qui secuti sunt, alienae erant."

ridicules) or the filling out of half a line with a single word, in the reintroduction (for Roman taste had already repudiated it) of Latin compounds made in imitation of the Greek. The list could be increased and should embrace both syntactical and stylistic imitations, some of which can be definitely traced, while others in the loss of corresponding Greek literature can only be felt. But it is not necessary to labor the point. Students of Catullus will be able to furnish examples for all of the categories named and for others that I have omitted. That the work of Catullus, therefore, and of the school which he represents, displays a well-defined, deliberate, Grecizing tendency, looking toward sweetness and sensuousness of poetical effect, is a conclusion which I imagine will be generally granted, nor do I urge it as a novel point of view.¹ Their art came to be recognized as the *dolce stil nuovo* of Latin poetry. Its novelty was felt in the contrast which it presented to that which was held in highest esteem by Romans of the time and, according to age and taste, it was praised or blamed. *O poetam egregium* (Cicero writes of Ennius in words often quoted), *quamquam ab his cantoribus Euphoriōnis contemnitur*.² For us it is enough to set side by side with one of the longer poems of Catullus a corresponding passage of Lucretius (in lieu of Ennius) to feel the contrast much as Cicero felt it.

But not only in Catullus are these traits of Greek adaptation strongly marked. The *Ciris*, for example (whether it be considered a juvenile effort of Virgil, the work of Gallus, or, in accordance with Sudhaus' theory, an anonymous cento of neoteric imitation), is apparently a most typical example of the epyllion, as cultivated by those who felt the double influence of Hellenistic models and Roman predecessors. Beyond any extant work of similar compass it displays a *color Graecus* such as was characteristic of the whole type.³ Worth

¹ Cf. Norden, *Einl. in d. Altertumswissenschaft*, I, 477: "Die lateinische Literatursprache ist in keiner Phase ihrer Existenz mehr in Gefahr gewesen, ihre *potentia* der griechischen *gratia* aufzuopfern."

² Cf. Sniehotta, *op. cit.*, p. 63: "Hi poetae quibus *μετέποι* nomen datum est, a Cicerone saepius reprehensi sunt, quod novum genus in poesin introducerent nimis graecissantes."

³ See especially Ganzenmüller, *Jhbb. Supl.* XX, 639, with interesting details, and Skutsch, *Gallus u. Vergil*, p. 95. For its general traits and relation to Catullus, Cinna, and Calvus see Sudhaus, *Hermes*, XLII (1907), 469 ff., and summary, p. 504.

quoting is the stylistic characterization which the author gives of his work:

quamvis interdum ludere nobis
et gracilem molli liceat pede claudere versum, [19-20]

which might pass as a formulation of creed for all of this neo-Hellenistic group. The Grecizing traits are much the same as those enumerated above for Catullus, except for the use of compound words. In the free use of Greek words other than proper names it even surpasses Catullus, and probably indeed any other comparable product of Roman poetry. Whatever its authorship and the explanation of the puzzling problems of relationship which it presents, it is a typical product of the school of poetry which, after the death of Catullus and Calvus and Cinna, still enjoyed vigorous life and counted among its leaders Valerius Cato.

That the use of Greek in the colloquial jargon of Lucilius and in the highly flavored verses of elegy and epyllion is a very different and almost unrelated phenomenon did not apparently prevent Cato or his pupils from grouping the two things together:

sermo lingua concinnus utraque
suavior, ut Chio nota si commixta Falerni est.

This has been thought of as a scarcely serious or sincere argument, invented by Horace. But not so. It is the same point of view which we find specifically enunciated by so competent a theorist as Quintilian, and rests upon the persuasion which Quintilian develops at length—that the sound of Greek was far more pleasing and musical than that of Latin. To this subject a considerable section is devoted in the twelfth book (10. 27-34), which in this connection makes interesting reading. It concludes: *itaque tanto est sermo Graecus Latino iucundior, ut nostri poetae, quotiens dulce carmen esse voluerunt, illorum id nominibus exornent*. This belief, to which Horace alludes with briefer phrase (*suavior*), is doubtless a very inadequate justification for Lucilius' Greek, but it is the kind of a defense that might be expected from Horace's opponents, for it is of the very essence of the neoteric creed of style. In their use of Greek proper names of persons or places there is, to be sure, an associative value with myth and story, which may be thought of as independent of sound, but for the most part such names are sought

as yield a vocalism little impeded by consonants and of a soft and pleasing rhythm. Examples (drawn from Catullus) like *Amphytryoniades*, *Protesilaëam*, or *Androgeoneae*, each of which fills out half a line,¹ are only extreme instances of a tendency which is equally shown by many shorter words, *Aetaeos*, *Penelopeo*, *Aganippe*, *Lari-saea*, *Nereine*, *Minois*, *Booten*, *Itoni*, and the favorite *Eoa*. Such words gave a vocalic quality to the verse which the ancient critics recognized by a special name, *versus vocales*, *qui alte producta elocutione sonantibus litteris universam dictionem inlustrant*.² To illustrate by one or two whole lines:

lymphaque in Oetaeis Malia Thermopylis [68. 54],

or most extreme of all in exotic effect,

proximus Hydrochoi fulgeret Oarion [66. 94].

Catullus is more sparing in his use of Greek appellatives, but a similar tendency is discernible here. *Leoni* and *leonibus* will do for the inflected forms, but the more sonorous *leaena* takes the place of *leo*; *lympa* has all but banished *aqua*; a large number of rather highly colored nouns, foreign to Latin up to this time, are to be found, such as *barathrum*, *bombus*, *calathiscus*, *crocinus*, *hyacinthus*, *mitra*, *parthenice*, *strophium*, *thiasus*, *thyrsus*, etc.³

The reaction from the excessive Grecism of the neoteric school—its daintiness and sweetness—began, as I believe, with Messala and Varius and Horace, just at the time with which we are dealing. But it was still a live question in the time of Persius, and constitutes part of the theme of the first satire. Ridiculing the effeminate literary ambitions of the day, the satirist gives some specimens of the kind of poetry which reveals Roman degeneracy from the sounder taste of an earlier age. The examples are characterized by Greek words and names, and are of the same type as the verses of Catullus,

¹ The employment of words containing two or more metrical feet is to be avoided in *clausula*, Quint. (9. 4. 64) teaches, and adds significantly for our argument: "quod etiam in carminibus est permolle."

² Diomedes, *G.L.*, I, p. 499 (extr.), with an example of which I cite the first line: "Eoo Oceano Hyperion fulgurat Euro."

³ Cf. Ellis, *Com.*, xxxi, and Baehrens, *Proleg.*, 46, for fuller (but not complete) list, which would contain a great many colloquial words irrelevant to this context. An actual statistic of Greek words in the *Ciris*, which is somewhat more extreme than Catullus, is given by Ganzemüller, *op. cit.*, p. 640, and amounts to 11 per cent of all words used.

and the *Ciris*, which we have been considering: *Berecynthius Attis; dirimebat nerea delphin; torva Mimalloneis implerunt cornua bombis* (which reads like a parody of Catullus 64. 263, *multis raucisonos efflabant cornua bombos*). *Arma virum* (he continues)—“by the sacred shade of Virgil! is not this the veriest drivel, and lighter than cork”? And then after some other examples: “could this thing be if there survived within us a particle of our father’s manhood”? The scholiast comments: *non sunt Persii, sed poetae nescio cuius graecisantis . . . sic robur Latinae eviravimus linguae intermiscendo Graecas glossulas*. Cf. also schol. ad vs. 103. In the same general direction of satire is a familiar passage of Juvenal (3. 60 ff.):

non possum ferre Quirites
Graecam urbem.
• • • • •
Rusticus ille tuus sumit trechedipna, Quirine,
et ceromatico fert niceteria collo.

The humor—and satire—of the last line lies in the parody of the Grecizing poetical manner, its softness and effeminacy contrasting with the ancient tradition of Roman virility.¹

Juvenal's appeal to Quirinus may take us back again to Horace (*vetuit me tali voce Quirinus*). It is plain, I think, that Horace's plea for pure Latin is not wholly a matter of stylistic principle; he entertains a certain national pride in the matter—that Romans should make it a point of scruple and conscience to preserve the integrity of Roman speech. His words are addressed in the first instance to the criticism of Lucilius, but their ultimate goal is those who in his own time were perverting Latin poetry by Greek words and Greek stylistic fashions. It would seem too that Horace raises protest against the whole habit of literary trifling with the lighter Greek forms—*versiculos Graecos*—an accomplishment which already belonged to the education of a Roman gentleman, as in the time of Persius (i. 70), *nugari solitos Graece*. The vogue of such literary activity is apparent, not only from Catullus and those whom his pages reflect, but from such collections as the Virgilian *Catalepta*, and the epigrams of

¹ Cf. Quint. i. 5. 59 (on Greek inflections): "ac si reperiās grammaticum veterum amatorem, neget quidquam ex Latina ratione mutandum . . . quin etiam laudet virtutem eorum, qui potentiores facere linguam Latinam studebant nec alienis egere institutis fantebant." Cf. also Juv. 6. 188 ff.

Furius quoted by Suetonius. That Horace was not alone in his hostility has already been implied. In fact, it is rather to be assumed that Horace was the recipient of doctrines of Latin purity which had come to him through the medium of Asinius and Messala from the purists of the Ciceronian time, Caesar, Calvus, Brutus, and others. The creed was originally applied to oratory and prose. It can scarcely have been thought of in Catullus' day as applicable to poetry. (Was the *Io* of Calvus executed in the spirit of the *Attis*, the *Peleus and Thetis*, and the *Allius* elegy? Most probably, yes; but, if so, it is clear that Calvus left his Atticism in the forum and did not fear the reproach of inconsistency.) Of the zeal of Messala, devoted to the attainment and inculcation of a pure Latinity, a slight survey of the testimonia in Meyer's *Fragmenta* (p. 507²) is sufficient evidence: *fuit Messala exactissimi ingeni in omni studiorum parte, Latini utique sermonis observator diligentissimus*. (Seneca, *Cont.* 2. 4. 8). These words do not refer merely to avoidance of Greek (as is commonly interpreted), but to all the niceties of usage in the choice of Latin words with reference to form and meaning which constituted *Latinitas*. Not many examples of Messala's practice and teaching in this regard have come down to us,¹ but they are sufficient to reveal a tendency which, in his case as well as in Pollio's, may have descended to a pedantic preciousness.

The corresponding studies of Asinius Pollio are better attested, but I will refer to only one example, since it touches Catullus. For it appears that a special monograph had been devoted to Catullus, which is quoted by Charisius as *Asinius in Valerium*.² The fragment cited lays down the rule that *pugillares* is always plural and masculine, whereas Catullus (42. 5) uses *pugillaria*. The observation is slight; it is only a straw, but it serves to show the direction of the wind. A breath of pedantry? Perhaps. But consider how trivial a century hence the question of "point of view" or "view-point" (which now makes your flesh creep) will seem. What other things in Catullus Asinius found to criticize cannot be determined, but one conjecture may be permitted. His satire of the language

¹ See the examples in Funaioli, p. 505: *Gladiola, cognomentum, duapondo, reatum*, etc. Quintilian speaks of whole books devoted to single letters (i. 7. 35), which may be merely a generalization of the *liber de S littera* (*ibid.* 23).

² Funaioli, p. 499.

or speech of Livy as *Patavinitas* is notorious. With a similar touch of contempt for the provincialism of the same region, someone is author of the remark, which Quintilian quotes, that *Catullus* "*ploxenum*" *circa Padum invenit* (1. 5. 8). Was it perhaps Asinius?

Rome, for all that it was sterile and unproductive of literary genius, laid claim to the dictatorship of Latin speech.¹ It was difficult and probably impossible for the non-Roman to meet all the refinements of usage and tradition which, to city-born purists like Asinius and Messala, constituted the essentials of good Latin. Messala's slighting comment on the famous Spanish declaimer, Porcius Latro—*sua lingua disertus*, "eloquent, yes; but in his own language"—is sharp but probably typical of the whole attitude of such purists. There must, in fact, have been much in the language of this brilliant group of poets from Northern Italy and Gaul which, to ears so fastidious, was open to the charge of provincialism and defective Latinity.² Horace perhaps escaped by virtue of a childhood spent at Rome, and was not, therefore, afraid to throw stones at Furius for "murdering Memnon." Cato himself Horace does not attack directly on this score, though he strives to implicate him in the general charge by ridiculing the praise which had been bestowed upon Lucilius for elegance of style (*limator*). Virgil, in spite of the praise of Horace's group, did not escape, and his provincial origin afforded a handle for ill-natured parody which was elicited by his earliest work (*prolati* *Bucolicis Numitorius quidam rescripsit Antibucolica*):

dic mihi, Damoeta, cuium pecus? anne Latinum?
Non, verum Aegonis; nostri sic rure loquuntur.³

¹ It was probably due to the influence and claims of the scholars of this period that Roman usage became fixed as the norm of pure Latinity. "*Latinitas est incorrupta loquendi observatio secundum Romanam linguam*" (Diom., p. 439). The definition is commonly attributed to Varro (Wilmanns and Funaioli). But Varro protests (*R.R.* i. 2. 1) against the innovations of *hi recentes urbani* in more than one place. It is probable that he would have preferred rather the older definition, which is found in the *Auct. ad Her.* 4. 17: "*sermo purus ab omni vitio remotus*." Quintilian, too, at a later time is more generous: "*licet omnia Italica pro Romanis habeam*" (1. 5. 56), though his words show that the definition *secundum Romanam linguam* still prevailed.

² Cf. Cic. *Brutus* 171: "*cum in Galliam veneris, audies verba quaedam non trita Romae; illud est maius quod in vocibus nostrorum oratorum retinnit quiddam et resonat urbanus*."

³ Cf. Macrobius 5. 2. 1: "*unde enim Veneto rusticis parentibus nato inter silvas et frutices educto vel levis Graecarum notitia litterarum*."

But the special manifestation of this purism with which we are now concerned is the avoidance of Greek words in Latin. For Messala the direct evidence is perhaps no more than the scholia on vs. 29, which in several different versions report his painstaking observance of this rule, and cite his revival of *funambulus* (from Terence) for the customary and colloquial *σχοινοβάτης*. A similar tendency may be observed in the fragment, cited above (p. 332), in which he speaks of *litteratore Catone* with manifest avoidance of the current and technical name *grammatico*. Equally significant is the inference which may be drawn from the reported attitude of Tiberius, and its relation to the teaching and practice of Messala:

In oratione Latina secutus est Corvinum Messalam Sermone Graeco, quamquam alioqui promptus et facilis, non tamen usque quaque usus est, abstinuitque maxime in senatu; adeo quidem, ut *monopolium* nominaturus veniam prius postularet quod sibi verbo peregrino utendum esset. [Suet. *Tib.* 70 and 71, with other examples.]

But this rigor did not, of course, signify antipathy to Greek as such; for, just as we know that Messala admired and translated Hyperides, so Tiberius was especially devoted to the Greek *νέωτεροι*, Euphronion, Rhianus, and Parthenius. But Latin must be pure, and not only free from alien words, but scrupulously correct in the use of Latin words themselves, in accordance with the niceties of diction laid down by the Roman *précieux*: *adfectatione et morositate nimia obscurabat stilum* (*ibid.* 70), a judgment which recalls Cicero's verdict on the meticulous purity of Calvus.¹

Still one other witness to the ban upon Greek words may be adduced from this literary circle, L. Varius, the friend and literary executor of Virgil, whose pre-eminence in epic Horace recognizes in this same satire (vs. 43): *forte epos* (perhaps in contrast to the fashionable epyllion) *ut nemo ducit*. The evidence for his position is slight but certain. It is contained in one of the epigrams of the Virgilian *Catalepta*:

Scilicet, hoc sine fraude, Vari dulcissime, dicam:
dispeream nisi me perdidit iste pothos.
sin autem praecepta vetant me dicere, sane
non dicam, sed me perdidit iste puer. [7.]

¹ *Brutus* 283: "nimium inquirens in se atque ipse sese observans metuensque ne vitiosum colligeret, etiam verum sanguinem deperdebat."

The point of the lines consists, not in their erotic content, but in Virgil's banter of Varius for his stern *praecepta* (*Latinitatis*).¹ One might suspect that Virgil had already written the second line as it stands here; on being taken to task for the concluding word, he replied with this epigram. But was he convinced? Scarcely; the substitution sounds like an effort to ruin by parody a line which derives what poetry there is in it from the Greek word. Nor did Virgil remain a convert to the new doctrine; Greek words continued to be ready at hand for him whenever they suited the effect at which he aimed, and drew upon him the same sort of criticism which Horace here directs against Lucilius and his champion.²

Although Virgil is included among the poets of the new age whom Horace arrays against the neoteric school of Cato, yet by origin he is a disciple of Catullus and the Alexandrines. His indebtedness to Catullus is most marked in the short poems of the *Catalepta*,³ but from the same sources of inspiration he has learned that sweetness and daintiness of style which is so often found in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*. Not infrequently this quality depends essentially upon a delicate use of Greek words and names, as in *Ecl.* 7. 37:

Nerine Galatea, thymo mihi dulcior Hyblae,
candidior cygnis, edera formosior alba.

The spell which the melody of Greek names exercised upon Virgil is nicely illustrated also by a line of the *Georgics*, which Gellius quotes with interesting comment:

Glauco et Panopeae et Inoo Melicertae [1. 437].

The verse is imitated from Parthenius (he says) with slight but pleasing change—*duobus vocabulis venuste immutatis*. Not so successful is an example of adaptation from Homer, for the verse of Homer is *simplicior et sincerior*, *Vergilii autem νεωτερικώτερος*—a noteworthy bit of criticism, with acute apprehension of the Virgilian manner and its *provenance*. Even the *Aeneid* is not free from this exuberant

¹ For the reading *pothos* (MSS, *pothus*) see Birt, *Jugendverse Vergils*, p. 82, and commentary.

² Cf. Macrobius (1. 24. 7), who draws from early sources the matter which he puts into the mouths of his interlocutors: "vel si mille alia multum pudenda seu in *verbis modo Graecis modo barbaris* seu in ipsa dispositione operis deprehenderentur." *Id.* 6. 4. 17: "inseruit operi suo et Graeca verba."

³ See Birt's Commentary, *passim*.

toying with the music of Greek names: 2. 262, *Acamasque Thoasque*; 5. 825, *Melite Panopeaque virgo*; 826, *Thaliaque Cymodoceque*; 6. 480, *Parthenopaeus It. Adrasti*; 483 *Medontaque Thersilochumque* (cf. whole context of these passages). But on the whole, in spite of Greek names and inflections, its verse is more vigorous and severe than either of the earlier works. Virgil had in the meantime learned to recognize an austere beauty in the verse of Ennius, which as a younger man he had not felt.¹

The banishment of Greek words from oratorical prose had long been effected. The earlier tendencies of Latin poetry from Ennius on had been in the same direction. But Alexandrine and contemporary Greek influences of the first half of the first century had resulted in a sudden Grecizing of poetry in a great variety of ways, which threatened to overwhelm and engulf the older national traditions. The movement of reaction we find represented, so far as the employment of Greek words is concerned, by three names, all of which are represented in our satire—Varius, Messala, and Horace. How much else of common literary program this group shared is not so easy to determine. But as avoidance of Greek is only one aspect of stylistic purity, so it appears that they took upon themselves the special defense of faultless Latinity, under the leadership of Messala and Asinius, masters of prose. The simplification of the poetical period (which in Catullus' longer poems and in the *Ciris* is still long and unwieldy) may be looked upon most naturally as a manifestation of the same efforts which were being directed toward the simplification of the Latin prose sentence. The prose of Roman Atticism is unfortunately lost, but we may catch some hint of its quality, I imagine, from the satires of Horace. It is an interesting nor wholly idle pastime to take one of the Horatian satires (like i. 9, for example) and read it as nearly as possible free from the trammels of verse, in accordance with the poet's own suggestion—*eripias si tempora certa modosque, etc.*

The most essential stylistic principle which Horace affords is set forth primarily for the writing of satire; but it will be recognized also as the rule which governed his whole stylistic practice: *sermone opus*

¹ Cf. Seneca *ap. Gell.* 12. 2. 10: "Vergilius quoque noster non ex alia causa duos quosdam versus et enormes et aliquid supra mensuram trahentis interposuit quam ut Ennianus populus adgnosceret in novo carmine aliquid antiquitatis." See Norden's recent book, *Ennius u. Vergil*, Leipzig, 1915, especially p. 153 ff.

est defendente vicem urbani, parcentis viribus atque extenuantis eas consulto—that is, refinement and restraint. It is scarcely necessary to illustrate this principle by other utterances from Horace, which could be adduced in abundance. Let it suffice to cite merely the injunction laid down in the *Art of Poetry* with regard to the choice of words and their joining:

in verbis etiam tenuis cautusque serendis,
hoc amet, hoc spernat promissi carminis auctor. [46.]

For Messala our evidence is of the same kind: painstaking in the choice of words—*in verbis magis elaboratus* (quam Cicero), as Tacitus says (*Dial.* 18), elegant (*nitidus*), clear, and pure (*candidus*), in his translations from the Greek vying with Hyperides in *illa difficillima Romanis subtilitate* (Quint. 10. 1. 113 and 5. 2). A hint of his restraint and fondness for too little rather than too much is contained in the characteristic anecdote of Seneca Rhetor apropos of *Aeneid* 11. 290: *Messala aiebat hic* [i.e., after *haesit*] *Vergilium debuisse desinere: quod sequitur explementum est* (*Suas.* 2. 20).¹

It has been said above that the literary work of the poets whom Horace names shows a return to forms which had been cultivated by the older Roman poetry. They were, to be sure, without doubt like Horace himself hostile to the crude workmanship of that older poetry, but their effort was apparently to re-create those substantial forms in a finish and perfection of style which should correspond to the demands of the newer time. In this direction Virgil also worked at a later time with his *Aeneid* (if indeed his *Georgics* do not belong in this category), giving to the Romans a national epic embodying the spirit and Roman dignity of the *Annales*, but executed with an art and stylistic form incomparably more perfect. Something of the same sort could be said of Livy's *History*, which in spirit and purpose does not rise above the older Roman annalists, however much it surpasses them in eloquence and literary form.²

¹ Just as the style of Calvus seemed to Cicero lacking in vigor (*verum sanguinem deperdebat*, *Brut.* 283; *vis non erat*, *Ad fam.* 15. 21), so Quintilian speaks of Messala as *viribus minor* (10. 1. 113). Horace did not escape the same censure: "*sine nervis altera quidquid composui pars esse putat.*" It is the critical counterpart of his own creed, *parcentis viribus*.

² Cf. Norden, *Aen.* vi, p. 361: "Jene eigenthümliche Mischung von Altem mit Neuem, die ein hervorstechendes Kennzeichen der augusteischen Aera ist," etc. I have indicated elsewhere that the studies of the Roman purists, like the Greek Atticists, were archaistic in tendency (cf. "The *de Analogia* of Julius Caesar," *Classical Philology*, I, 101).

The antithesis which I have endeavored to point out between Horace and his friends on the one side, and the school of Cato and Furius on the other, may be traced somewhat further into the Augustan age. For convenience, and without aiming to make rigid categories, we may call the one group Roman or nationalistic, the other Grecizing or Hellenistic. To the former we may now add Tibullus, who, although he uses the elegy, a Hellenistic form, nevertheless deserves to rank as perhaps the most purely Roman of all Latin poets. In literary affiliation he is the friend and client of Messala, a circumstance which justifies the belief that in no small degree he owes to the influence of his patron's principles that careful erasure and elimination of everything that would reveal Greek models or Greek sources of literary influence. In the use of Greek words, Greek proper names, and Greek inflections he is the most sparing of all Roman poets. It was obviously his aim and purpose to create the impression of a Roman poetry native and untouched by foreign models. That which is here said of Tibullus applies equally to the Lygdamus and Sulpicia elegies of the Corpus Tibullianum. Propertius, on the other hand, avows fully and frankly his indebtedness to Greek influences, and in the use of Greek words and Greek inflections, in the whole color of his work, is perhaps most frankly Greek of all the poets of the Augustan age.¹ It is not my purpose to pursue this theme further at the present time. It is a subject so large and so dependent for interest upon illustrative details that to touch it merely in passing is futile and open to the danger of loose generalization, the curse of literary history. I venture, however, to add Ovid to the sequence of the Grecizing poets, but with the qualification that his singular formal talent has accommodated Greek technique to Latin speech with such flexible and plastic art that it is scarcely felt any longer as foreign.²

NEW HAVEN

¹ For Tibullus and Propertius cf. Leo in *Kultur d. Gegenwart*, p. 449 (3d ed.). For the purism of Tibullus see the very interesting study of R. Bürger, "Beiträge zur Elegantia Tibulls," in the volume in honor of Leo, *Xáμρες*, Berlin, 1911.

² I feel that an explanation is due to the readers of this journal for not having taken account of Professor Ullman's acute and suggestive study, in *Classical Philology*, X (1915), entitled "Horace, Catullus, and Tigellius." The truth is that our conceptions of the literary relations between Horace and the neoteric school are so radically at variance that incidental criticism seemed futile, while, obviously, thoroughgoing examination of his position was impossible. It seemed best, therefore, at the present time to confine myself to the positive presentation of my own point of view, reserving criticism for another time.